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ABSTRACT
We present an original framework for the detection of repeating objects in multimedia streams. This framework is designed so that it can work with any fingerprint model. A fingerprint is extracted for each incoming frame of the multimedia stream. The framework then manages this fingerprint so that if one similar frame comes later in the stream, it will be identified as a repetition. The framework has been tested with two distinct fingerprint models on simulated and ‘real-world’ data. The results show that the framework performs well with both presented models and that it is suitable for industrial use-cases.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Multimedia streams often contain repetitive data (see [1]). Depending on the considered medium, repeated objects can be entire programs, songs, advertisements or jingles. Let us note that the repeated objects might however be distorted from one version to the other (different volume, different equalization, addition of noise, ...). For numerous reasons, it is interesting to automatically detect these repetitions. Applications include compression, automatic annotation of repeating objects, segmentation and data mining.

As some authors have pointed out [2], it is relevant to use the notion of fingerprint for fast detection of a repetition. A fingerprint in signal processing can be viewed as a compact representation of a signal excerpt. This representation is designed so that two similar signals should have the same fingerprint. When it is queried with an unknown signal, the challenge for a fingerprinting system is to perform an efficient search. Indeed, it has to compare the unknown fingerprint with a reference database that usually contains thousands of them. Hence, the powerful summary and indexing capabilities that are required for a fingerprint system suit well the repeating objects detection problem.

Although methods have been proposed [2, 1, 3], each comes as a specific combination of a detection method and a fingerprint. In this work, we present a general framework that allows the use of any fingerprint extraction system for the detection of repeating objects. The only requirement is that the fingerprint extraction system outputs a set of time-localized keys for any frame of signal. This is the case for most fingerprint systems. They usually use this set of keys in an indexing scheme for fast detection. For instance, Wang’s fingerprint system [4] (also known as Shazam’s system) extracts time-localized pairs of peaks in the spectrogram and uses them as database keys. Haitsma’s [5] (known as Philip’s system) extracts one binary feature every 10ms that summarizes the spectral content. The authors call these features ‘hashes’ and use them as keys in a ’look-up table’. In spite of the general applicability of the framework, we have restricted our experiments to audio use-cases. However, one should note that indexing tasks on multimedia signals (e.g. video) can often be achieved by working on the sole audio component [6].

In the first section, we describe the framework and all its components. In the second section, we provide two examples of fingerprints that have been integrated in the framework. Finally, we test these configurations in two distinct experiments. The first experiment is meant to accurately evaluate the performance of the systems. The second one is based on a ‘real-world’ use-case.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE FRAMEWORK

2.1. General architecture
We describe here the general flow of the framework, given in Figure 1. The stream is framed and then linearly processed. Each frame undergoes a fingerprint extraction. From here, the system forks. One branch is dedicated to analyzing the fingerprint (in practical terms, looking for matches in the past), the other is dedicated to storing the fingerprint in the database containing the past fingerprints. In the analysis branch, the fingerprint is matched against the database containing the previous frames’ fingerprints. Based on this matching result combined with the matching results of previ-
ous frames, a repetition detection decision is taken. In case of
a detected repetition, the 'storage branch' is updated so that it
will not store repeated frames in the database. In the storage
branch, the frame’s fingerprint is pushed into a FIFO ('First In
First Out') buffer. This buffer delays subsequent storage pro-
cessing for this frame. As the current frame fingerprint enters
the buffer, the last fingerprint of the FIFO buffer is pushed
into the database. Though, this latter will be written only if it
has not been detected as part of a repeating segment.

The different building blocks of this general framework
are further described below.

2.2. Framing and fingerprinting

The input stream is sliced in non-overlapping analysis frames
\( f_n \) (\( n \in \mathbb{N} \)) of length \( L_a \). A typical value for \( L_a \) is 5s. For a
given analysis frame, the fingerprint module outputs a set of
features along with their dates of occurrence. We call these
extracted features keys. Formally, we define \( K \) the set of keys
extracted in \( f_n \). Let \( O_k(f_n) \) be the number of occurrences
of the key \( k \) in \( f_n \). We then define \( t_k(f_n) = \{t^i_k(f_n)\}_{i=1,..,O_k(f_n)} \)
the set of times of occurrence of the key \( k \) in the frame \( f_n \).
The output of the fingerprint module is \( \{(k, t_k(f_n))\}_{k \in K} \).

The database contains all the keys that have been extracted
in the past stream with their times of occurrence in the stream.
As it is meant to represent the past of the stream, we use the
notation \( f_{-1} \) to refer to the database. Consequently, a key \( k \)
appears \( O_k(f_{-1}) \) times in the database at times of occurrence
\( \{t^i_k(f_{-1})\}_{i=1,..,O_k(f_{-1})} \). When querying the database with key
\( k \), we get in output \( \{t^i_k(f_{-1})\}_{i=1,..,O_k(f_{-1})} \). Our implementa-
tion uses the database engine "Berkeley DB" set to its "Hash
Table" mode.

2.3. Analysis

The analysis starts with the fusion step. It aims at finding
the closest match to the current analysis frame in the stream.
The main idea is that if the current frame is the repetition of
a previous section of the stream, its keys should all be stored
in the database. Furthermore, all the keys extracted from the
analysis frame should be retrieved in the past with the same
delay. We then adopt the following methodology to find the
best candidate in the past.

We compute the set of differences
\[
\{(t^i_k(f_n) - t^j_k(f_{-1}))\}_{(i,j)\in[1:O_k(f_n)]\times[1:O_k(f_{-1})]}\}_{k \in K}
\]
We store these time differences in a histogram. The highest
peak in the histogram gives the best candidate delay for a rep-
etition.

Let us note that this methodology ensures the retrieval of
the best candidate. Though, it does not require that all keys
are preserved from one version to the other. It only requires
that the majority of the keys are preserved. This makes the
method robust to distortions that would corrupt part of the
keys between the two versions. In order to bring even more
robustness to the system, we output the \( M \) best candidate de-
lays.

The work presented in [7] underlines the fact that the per-
formance of a fingerprint system is much higher when issuing
detections based on a vote mechanism involving several suc-
cessive matching results rather than making a frame-by-frame
decision. This idea is also exploited in the work from [8]. Our
framework thus stores the matching results of several succes-
sive analysis frames before making a detection decision. The
fusion step outputs a vector of \( M \) best candidates (that we call
Single Frame Candidates Vector - SFCV) that is integrated in
a \( H \times M \) matrix that contains the \( H \) (for horizon) last SFCVs.
We call this matrix the Multiple Frames Candidates Matrix -
MFCM.

The last step of the analysis is a majority vote on the
MFCM. Previous works suggest the following vote mecha-
nism. For a given detection threshold \( \theta \), let \( M_n \) be the MFCM
after integrating the matching results of frame \( f_n \). Let \( C \) be
the set of candidate delays that appear in \( M_n \) and \( h \) be a func-
tion that counts the number of occurrences of a candidate in
the MFCM. Let \( \delta \) be a function that is defined by:
\[
\delta(x, y) = \begin{cases} 
  x & \text{if } y > \theta \\
  \emptyset & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

The vote function is then defined by:

\[
v(M_n) = \delta(\text{argmax}_{c \in C} \{ h(c) \}, \text{max}_{c \in C} \{ h(c) \})
\]

However, this vote model may generate some instability when dealing with objects that contain an inherent repetitive structure. For example, let us imagine that the database contains one song with two similar choruses. As a consequence, when processing an analysis frame belonging to a chorus of the same song, the two choruses in the database will be candidates in the MFCM. Besides, their number of occurrences in the MFCM will be very close. The result is that, when processing the successive analysis frames of a chorus, the detections issued by the vote algorithm may look like that: chorus1-chorus2-chorus1-chorus1-chorus2...

This, of course, is not desirable, since we would like our algorithm to consider that the successive analysis frames all belong to the same chorus. Ideally, we would like the algorithm to detect chorus1 when processing the first analysis frames containing a chorus and chorus2 later on in the stream.

In order to achieve this goal, we modify the preceding vote model so that it becomes auto-regressive. The autoregressive aspect is obtained by favoring the delay that best corresponds to the preceding vote result. This ensures a certain continuity in the algorithm detections. So, if the start of the song has been detected, and when reaching the chorus, the algorithm will naturally tend to select the first chorus of the song in the database. Formally it consists of replacing function \( h \) in the vote by \( \tilde{h} \), which is defined by:

\[
\tilde{h}(c) = \begin{cases} 
  h(c) + \beta & \text{if } v(M_{n-1}) = c \\
  h(c) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

In our implementation, \( \beta = 1 \).

2.4. Storage

One of the principles of the framework is to store the fingerprints of the analysis frames that have been processed in a database. However, we do not wish to store in this database the fingerprints of the frames that are detected as repetitions. There are two reasons for that. First, it would be a waste of space. Second, when matching a third fingerprint that would be alike, we would obtain two good candidates instead of one. That would uselessly jam the matching process.

As we have seen, the algorithm requires the matching results of \( H \) analysis frames before being able to make a decision. This is why we store in a temporary FIFO buffer the fingerprints of the processed analysis frames. This buffer contains \( B > H \) processed fingerprints. If further processing outputs a repetition detection for frame \( f_n \), its fingerprint in the FIFO buffer is labeled so that it will not be written in the database.

The FIFO buffer also has a screening function. Indeed, the repetitions that occur before \( B \) frames are not detected (since the corresponding fingerprints have not been added to the database). Depending on the use case, this can be useful to prevent over-segmentation. For instance, when segmenting a radio broadcast, one would usually want repeating segments that correspond to whole songs. Though, if there is no screening and if the songs contain repetitive choruses, the algorithm might annotate the songs in several repeating bits (the choruses) and unrecorded bits (the verses). By setting \( B \) to a larger value than the length of the song, we can prevent the system from detecting repetitions within the song.

2.5. Results

The framework outputs a decision for each analysis frame. It is either considered as a repetition of a previous frame, or as a first occurrence. A graphical illustration of the result is given in Figure 2. The origin point is the experiment starting date. Points on the diagonal indicate frames detected as first occurrences. Points outside of the diagonal indicate repeated frames. They are plotted with respect to their first occurrence dates.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE FINGERPRINTS

3.1. A CQT-based fingerprint

The first fingerprint we use is fully described in [7]. In short, the methodology consists of using a 2-dimensional peak-peaking in the Constant-Q-Transform (CQT) spectrogram of each analysis frame. The extracted peaks are then grouped in pairs. Each pair is encoded in a form that makes it robust to common audio-distortions. These encoded pairs are used as keys. Their time localizations are given by the times of occurrence of the first peaks in the pairs.
3.2. A sparse decomposition-based fingerprint

The fingerprint presented above is based on a peak picking mechanism in the time frequency domain. Alternatively one can build a fingerprint based on a sparse decomposition of the signal in a redundant dictionary. Let \( x \) be a framed signal \( x \in \mathbb{C}^N \) and \( \Phi \) be a dictionary of elementary waveforms \( \phi_k \in \mathbb{C}^N \) called atoms. We denote \( \hat{x}_m \) an \( m \)-term approximant of \( x \) in \( \Phi \), that is to say a linear combination of \( m \) waveforms: \( \hat{x}_m = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \alpha_i \phi_i \). There are many different ways of building such approximant. A fast one is to iteratively select the \( \phi_i \) according to an energetic criterion:

\[
\phi_i = \arg\max_{\phi \in \Phi} |\langle x - \hat{x}_{i-1}, \phi \rangle|
\]

Algorithms based on this greedy paradigm are called Matching Pursuits (MP) following the work of Mallat et al [9]. Sparse decompositions have initially been proposed for compression purposes. Indeed, in a variety of multimedia contexts, wavelet dictionaries (e.g. for images) and Fourier-based transforms (e.g. MDCT for audio) have enabled a fair amount of dimensionality reduction. The idea of exploiting sparse decompositions for fingerprinting has already been proposed (e.g. in [10]).

An \( m \)-term approximant \( \hat{x}_m \) can efficiently be used as a fingerprint if: 1) its dimension is much lower than that of \( x \) 2) two different signals would yield significantly different fingerprints and 3) the fingerprints exhibit some robustness to mild distortions. Most MP-like algorithms are only tailored for the first of these properties. However, in a fingerprint context, we are not interested in minimizing a reconstruction error, but in maximizing a discriminating power. Therefore, two options can be considered: either build a fingerprint from an existing \( m \)-term approximant or modify the decomposition algorithm so as to only select elements that will favor good fingerprint properties in \( \hat{x}_m \).

In this work we have implemented the second approach, and the following fingerprint construction is performed. We have used a multiscale MDCT dictionary and a plain MP algorithm with the additional property that atom selection in the time frequency neighborhood of previously selected atoms is discouraged. The selection criterion at iteration \( i \) becomes:

\[
\phi_i = \arg\max_{\phi \in \Phi} \lambda(\phi, \Phi_I) |\langle x - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \alpha_j \phi_j, \phi \rangle|
\]

where \( \Phi_I \) is the set of previously selected atoms and \( \lambda(\phi, \Phi_I) \) is a binary penalty term set to zero if any previously selected atom is in the time-frequency neighborhood of \( \phi \).

For a given analysis frame \( f_n \), an approximant \( \hat{f}_n^m \) is computed and the set of keys used by the fingerprinting system is simply the set of indexes of the \( m \) atoms chosen in the dictionary \( \Phi \). By limiting the decomposition to a small number \( m \) of iterations, the dimensionality can be greatly reduced. However, the fingerprint discriminative power increases with the number of atoms selected in the decomposed.

4. EXPERIMENTS AND COMPARISONS

4.1. Frame by frame evaluation

This task consists of determining for each incoming analysis frame whether it is a repetition of a previous frame. If so, the exact first occurrence in the stream is retrieved. A synthetic stream is built as a concatenation of 140 audio excerpts randomly taken from a pop song database\(^1\). Each excerpt lasts 30 seconds, 100 of them occur twice in the stream and the 40 remaining are not repeated. The total duration of the stream is thus 2 hours. Analysis frames are 5 seconds long, the complete dataset therefore consists of 1440 frames, 600 of which are exact repetitions of previous frames. The framework is evaluated with both presented fingerprints: the CQT-based fingerprint (labeled CQT-Peaks) and the MP-based fingerprint with a dictionary of 3 MDCT scales and stopped after 150 iterations (labeled MP-150). The two systems are compared in terms of precision, recall and F-measure. Additionally, we compare for each analysis frame the average time needed to compute its fingerprint and the total processing time (measured on the same Dual-Core CPU at 3.16GHz). Finally, we compare the size of the databases.

Table 1 summarizes the obtained results. The framework reaches a good level of precision with both fingerprints. The recall with the CQT-based fingerprints is better than when using the MP atom indexes. However, it is also more memory consuming. The MP-based fingerprints are smaller, but less robust as the recall shows. The CQT-based fingerprints are faster to compute but the matching process roughly requires the same amount of time for both methods. The results confirm the relevance of the proposed architecture as a generic repetition detection framework.

4.2. Real-world evaluation

In [11], the authors underline the importance of evaluating fingerprinting systems on real-world (i.e. coming from real broadcasts) data. We here follow their framework applied to

\(^1\)http://quaero.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fingerprint</th>
<th>Detected rep. / Total nb</th>
<th>False Alarms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CQT-Peaks</td>
<td>191 / 191 (=100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-150</td>
<td>178 / 191 (=93.2%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Repeating objects detection scores for a real-world radio broadcast

a 24-hours long radio broadcast for the evaluation of our system.

It is virtually impossible to get a frame-by-frame repetition annotation on a real broadcast. On the other hand, the use of the annotations provided within Quaero allows a detection-based evaluation. The annotations provide for each broadcast song in the 24-hours stream the identifier of the song, its broadcast time and duration. We extract from the annotations a repeat list. It contains, for each song that is broadcast for the second time or more, its time of broadcast, its duration and the song identifier.

We have set the vote parameters so that the system only outputs long scale repetitions ($H = 9, \theta = 6$). With these, no repetition shorter than 30s should be detected.

Our evaluation dataset contains numerous short repeating objects that are not annotated (advertisements, jingles, ...). A fair evaluation can only be performed on the music titles broadcasts. Therefore, we limit the evaluation to repeating segments that are longer than 90s. This matches the set of broadcast songs, for which we do have the annotations.

The evaluation is then defined as follows. For each repetition detected by the algorithm, we check that it does actually correspond to one entry of the repeat list (meaning the detection time is within the bounds of one repeated song and the algorithm points to a previous occurrence of the song). If one repetition is detected and does not correspond to any entry in the repeat list, we count one false alarm.

The results are given in table 2. Although both algorithms have performed well, the CQT fingerprints makes no error in this task. The MP-based method misses a few songs and has output one false alarm on the 24-hours broadcast. Let us note that avoiding false alarms in this task is far less challenging than in the previous experiment since we only consider long scale repetitions. This second evaluation shows that the framework is suitable for industrial applications and that it does actually fit real-world use-cases.

5. CONCLUSION

In this work we have presented a framework for the detection of repeating objects in multimedia streams. A remarkable feature of this architecture is that it can handle any time-based fingerprint. We have applied this framework to two distinct audio fingerprints and evaluated its performance. The evaluation has shown that the system performs well in both cases. More interestingly, this shows that the framework can be used as a test-bed for drawing comparisons between fingerprints in this specific use-case. Our evaluation includes a real-world experiment that shows that the framework is suitable for the detection of repeating objects in an industrial context.

In the future, it would be interesting to compare this approach with a “standard” fingerprint algorithm. Usual fingerprinting systems indeed rely on a prior static database that contains all the items that can be found in the analyzed multimedia streams. Our system builds its database adaptively as repeating objects occur in the stream. A final open question is whether this system can compete with traditional systems on a typical fingerprint use-case such as the broadcast monitoring described in [11].
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